

DA 962

MAA3

DA 962
.M443
Copy 1

Similarities Between the American and Irish Revolutions

Address before the Quarterly Meeting of the

**SOCIETY OF THE
FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK
In the City of New York
(INSTITUTED 1784)**

By
**THOMAS H. MAHONY
OF BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS**

Hotel Astor, New York
Monday Evening, May 2, 1921



DA 962
.M443
Copy 1

Similarities Between the American and Irish Revolutions

Address before the Quarterly Meeting of the

SOCIETY OF THE
FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK
In the City of New York
(INSTITUTED 1784)

By
THOMAS H. MAHONY
OF BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Hotel Astor, New York
Monday Evening, May 2, 1921

Gift
Author

BAR 22 1522

FOREWORD

IT was one of the great philosophers who said that the ideal form of government was a benevolent despotism. No believer in republican institutions will for a moment grant the truth of that statement ; and yet the informed student of affairs must admit that in certain essentials, monarchical government is, by its very nature, more efficient than a government of the people. It is more easily set in motion. It has a higher state of preparation for decisive action. It is generally staffed by men whose tenure of office is more certain and more extended, and thus has the benefit of greater experience with practical problems of government. More than all, it has a ruling class to which the special privileges belong as a matter of right, and their direct interest in their own continuance in power makes them reduce the art of government to a science, so far as possible, and solve the problems that arise from time to time, not by chance but by inherited skill, sharpened by all the knowledge gained from work along the same lines in past generations and centuries.

That such conditions make for tyranny is of no importance in the eyes of the members of such a class, as for them the end sought is not the liberty of a people but the preservation and extension of the right of a minority to rule a country and to impose their will upon weaker neighbors or distant colonies.

The English Empire is governed in this way by a ruling class which has in human history no equal in skill, adroitness, resourcefulness and demonstrated capacity for intrigue ; for power of making successful combinations against an enemy ; and for ability to make the worse appear the better part.

It would be impossible to set forth here a tithe of what could be adduced historically along these lines.

An instance in point of how carefully planned in advance and ruthlessly executed in fact, are their campaigns against all those with whom they fight was given to the members of the Society in the extraordinarily illuminating address of Mr. Thomas H. Mahony of the Boston Bar, at the Quarterly Meeting, at the Hotel Astor on May 2nd, 1921. Mr. Mahony, who is at once scholar, student of history, essayist and political philosopher, as well as one of the leading members of the younger bar of Massachusetts, a State famous for the ability and high character of its lawyers, had chosen as his subject "Similarities between the American and Irish Revolutions."

He has collected and set forth, with moderation of statement and delightful directness, a series of similarities in action, thought, plan and statement between these two great events that is simply astounding.

Even close students of history will open their eyes at finding the whole plan of campaign, carried on today against the people of Ireland, only a repetition of the conditions against which Washington and our forefathers had to fight for seven long years of actual war and for many years of preliminary if intermittent guerrilla war before they succeeded in driving tyranny, let us hope forever, from our shores.

His address must bring home, with increasing force to thoughtful men, the conviction that Ireland today, as America in the Revolution, struggles not alone against the English government, but against that system of imperialism of which the English ruling class is the last representative.

May the contest in Ireland end—as it did with us—in complete independence—an end that will not alone enure to the advantage of Ireland and of the liberty loving peoples of the world, but that will bring the people of England themselves nearer to that liberty which they deserve and of which they have so long been deprived!

DANIEL F. COHALAN,
President of the Society of the Friendly Sons
of St. Patrick in the City of New York.

IT is in one way most surprising that we should find in America so much opposition to Ireland's struggle for independence. The colonies rebelled against the same country, and established this nation as a result of such rebellion. Yet there are many who boast of their Americanism, their love of America's history, her traditions and her institutions, who yet deny to Ireland the right to follow America's example.

The great trouble is that such people forget the history of the American Revolution, if they ever knew it. They forget the causes which brought it about, the principles for which it was fought, and the events which transpired in the period of its duration. A survey of that period and a comparison of it with the Irish Revolution of today reveals a most startling similarity in all these matters, so that one who endorses the American Revolution, to be consistent, must necessarily endorse the Irish Revolution.

It is to be remembered that most of the colonies had been first settled by citizens of England, and that such colonies were, therefore, in the first instance British Colonies. Such other colonies as had been settled by citizens of other nations came into the possession of England by cession, so that at the time of the Revolution all the revolting colonies were in fact British Colonies.

Firstly let us consider the legislative oppression which led to the American Revolution. The colonies, while France controlled Canada, suffered but little from any control by England, being able to force such domestic legislation as was desired in the colonies by means of their legislative control of the governor's salary and of the imperial contributions, and openly ignoring any legislative action of Parliament which restricted in any way the commerce of the colonies.

After the removal of the French menace in Canada in 1763, however, England then set out to enforce all the legislation which had previously been enacted for the purpose of restricting the activi-

ties of the colonies, and also enacted new and additional measures of the same nature. Among such measures were the following:

1. The Navigation Act of 1651 preventing all nations except England from trading with the colonies.
2. The Navigation Act of 1660 restricting the right to export goods from the colonies and prohibiting the export of sugar, tobacco, etc., save to England.
3. The Trade Act of 1663 prohibiting importation to the colonies save in English ships.
4. The Trade Act of 1733, taxing spirits, sugar and molasses imported to the colonies.
5. The Trade Act of 1764 taxing coffee, wines, etc., appointing courts of admiralty to try cases of smuggling, involving the use of the Writs of Assistance.
6. The Stamp Act, 1765.
7. The Tax on paint, paper and glass, 1766.

The colonists at first took the position that there could be no taxation without representation, and that representation in Parliament as a practical matter was impossible. They later insisted that the English Parliament had no right whatever to legislate for the colonies.

With reference to Ireland, England's legislative coercion began with the first invasion under Henry II. Among such coercive measures are the following:

1. The statute of Kilkenny and similar acts to denationalize the Irish.
2. The confiscations and plantations under Henry the Eighth, Elizabeth, James I. and William III.
3. The persecutions of Cromwell.
4. The penal laws.
5. Land Laws.
6. The laws which destroyed Ireland's trade in cattle, wool, provision, shipping, linen, cotton and glass.

All these measures were intended to enslave or exterminate the Irish people, but bitterly and successfully the Irish people have resisted and defeated both purposes, and are today fighting more fiercely than ever against the same tyrannical oppressor.

It will be seen, therefore, that the legislative oppression exer-

cised by England against Ireland, while somewhat the same in kind as was exercised against the colonies, was intensified a thousandfold.

In addition to such measures as above stated, the colonies, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, complained of the following grievances against England:

“For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world.”

“For depriving us in many cases of the benefits of Trial by Jury.”

“For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offences.”

—and, referring to the king—

“He has kept among us, in times of Peace, Standing Armies, without the consent of our legislatures.”

“He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the Civil Power.”

“For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us.”

“For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States.”

“He has abdicated government here by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us.”

“He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.”

One hearing this for the first time might believe that Jefferson was writing of present day events in Ireland. And well might Seward, Lincoln’s War Secretary, say of Ireland:

“For less than the least of all the wrongs of which Ireland complains, America rebelled.”

And truly did Thurlow Weed, the great Republican, say in 1884:

“America dissolved the Union with England and raised the standard of rebellion, to redress but a tithe of the wrongs which have been inflicted on Ireland.”

If for these causes the colonies were justified in rebellion in 1776, Ireland is a thousand times more justified in her rebellion today.

Secondly, let us review the principles fought for in the American Revolution.

The philosophy of government as taught by Grotius of Holland, Puffendorf of Germany, Burlamaqui and Beccaria of Italy, Montes-

quiet of France, Locke and Hooker of England, had effectually destroyed in the minds of men the old belief of the "Divine Right of Kings." In its place they had set up the doctrine of "The Rights of Man."

"Natural society," said Burlamaqui, "is a state of equality and liberty; a state in which all men enjoy the same prerogatives, and an entire independence of any other power but God. For every man is naturally master of himself, and equal to his fellow creatures so long as he does not subject himself to another person's authority by a particular convention." (Principles of Natural Law, p. 38.)

In the colonies Paine was preaching the same doctrine. In his Essay on the "Rights of Man" he summed up this doctrine in the following words:

" . . . individuals themselves, each in his own personal and sovereign right enter into a compact with each other to produce a government, and this is the only mode in which governments have a right to be established, and the only principle on which they have a right to exist."

The colonists rested their entire claim to separation from England upon the basis of this philosophy. The Declaration of Independence proclaimed it to the world as the sole justification of America's nationhood. If those principles are unsound, America as a nation did not come into existence as of right, but solely as a result of force. The Declaration of Independence, reflecting such philosophy, proclaimed that:

" . . . *all men* are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, *governments* are instituted among *men*, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the *people* to alter or to abolish it. . . ."

Later France, following America's example in this philosophy of government, at the time of the French revolution, made a similar declaration of principles, known as the "Declaration of the Rights of Man." In this declaration France proclaimed that:

"the national assembly doth recognize and declare, in the presence of the Supreme Being, and with the hope of His blessing and favor, the following sacred rights of men and of citizens:

"I. Men are born and always continue free and equal in respect of their rights. Civil distinctions, therefore, can only be founded on public utility.

"II. The end of all political associations is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man; and these rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance of oppression.

"III. The nation is essentially the source of all sovereignty: nor can any individual or any body of men, be entitled to any authority which is not expressly derived from it."

In Ireland, Molyneux, as early as 1697, was arguing Ireland's rights to legislative independence upon this same philosophy and quoting in support thereof the writings of the Englishmen Hooker and Locke. Molyneux asserted that:

"All Men are by Nature in a State of Equality, in respect of Jurisdiction of Dominion. This I take to be a Principle in itself so evident that it stands in need of little Proof. 'Tis not to be conceiv'd, that Creatures of the same Species and Rank, promiscuously born to all the same Advantages of Nature, and the Use of the same Faculties, should be subordinate and subject one to another; These to this or that of the same Kind. On this Equality in Nature is founded that Right which all men claim, of being free from all Subjection to positive Laws, 'till by their own Consent they give up their Freedom, by entering into Civil Societies for the common Benefit of all the Members thereof. And on this Consent depends the Obligation of all *Human Laws*; insomuch that without it, by the unanimous Opinion of all *Jurists* no Sanctions are of any *Force*." (Case of Ireland Stated, Ed.—1795, pp. 101, 102.)

Clearly such principles by their very nature are universal, and necessarily universal in their application. If they applied to the American colonies in 1776 they apply to Ireland with even greater force today. For, as has been stated, the colonies were British by discovery, colonization or cession; the colonists were born to or accepted British Nationality. On the other hand, Ireland was entirely distinct from England in race, language, culture, politics and history. Ireland was not discovered, colonized or ceded to England, the latter's only existence in Ireland being based on force.

Thirdly, let us compare some of the events of both Revolutions:

We find the accusation flung far and wide by so-called Americans that the Irish Republican Army is no army at all, but a body of criminals and assassins, without uniforms, who, by their guerilla

warfare have spread a terrible reign of terror through Ireland, and that for such reason Ireland's claims are not to be considered.

Only the other day I heard of a story about the atrocities being perpetrated by the Irish Republican Army. It is told of one or two Irish Republican soldiers, who, lying in wait behind a stone wall, armed with small pistols, made a cowardly and dastardly attack upon a British armored tank and an armored motor lorry.

But the American Revolution was no society event. It was, on the other hand, says the Historian Fisher:

"A rank and riotous rebellion against long established authority."

"It was an out and out rebellion against legitimate control because we wanted to govern ourselves . . . and believed that the colonial position was at its best essentially a degradation to manhood, or as we called it at the time, 'political slavery.'" (Am. Rev. and Boer War, pp. 7, 8, 11.)

If the Irish are wrong in defending themselves against the invader by guerilla methods, then the colonists were wrong in applying the same methods to a similar rebellion against that same tyrant who vauntingly boasts that it can rule any and every people better than those people can rule themselves.

The colonists were armed with muskets and shot guns; they were the ridicule of the British regulars. When possible they seized the guns of the Britishers, as do now the Irish. The colonists were never decently armed until the French sent munitions in 1778. The men served a few weeks and then went home. Captain Grayden, describing the Army in New York, said: "The irregularity, want of discipline, bad arms, and defective equipment in all respects, of this multitudinous assemblage, gave no favorable impression of its prowess." (Memoirs, Ed. 1846, p. 147.)

We have all seen pictures of the Revolutionary soldiers, and doubtless have admired their magnificent appearance in their buff and blue uniforms. We have all taken it for granted that the army was uniformed, regularly organized, and fought regular battles. As a matter of fact, but a select few, mostly officers, had uniforms. The vast mass of the rebel troops had no uniforms at all.

Lafayette in 1777 said that the “eleven thousand men, but tolerably armed, and still worse clad, presented a singular spectacle in their parti colored and often naked state; the best dresses were hunting shirts of brown linen.” (Memoirs, I, p. 19.)

Washington in an order of July 24, 1776, refused to recommend any uniform because of the expense and difficulty of providing the same.

That was the kind of an irregular army that Washington led. It melted away from time to time, and about all he could do was to recommend and not command. In New York in 1776 he had 18,000 men, but after the battle of Long Island, when he crossed to New Jersey, he had but 3,300, the rest having scattered and gone to their homes.

Washington himself prepared to carry on guerilla warfare.

In Irving’s life of him appears a letter in which he said that if further pressed “we must then retire to Augusta County in Virginia. Numbers will repair to us for safety and we will then try a predatory war. If overpowered we must cross the Allegheny Mountains.”

Guerilla or predatory warfare had no taint of shame for Washington. God knows that England hated him even as she hates Ireland’s guerilla fighters today under Collins. But where Washington trod no man need hesitate follow.

In discussing irregular fighting, it is to be observed that there was no fighting in Ireland until after the Declaration of Independence in Easter week, 1916, which was indeed an open declaration of war against England, and a notice of what English troops might expect in Ireland. Independence was not declared in the colonies until July, 1776—yet prior to that time much fighting occurred.

In *March, 1770*, the *Boston Massacre* took place, comparable indeed to the Massacre at Bachelor’s walk in Dublin.

In *June, 1772*, the British Cruiser Gaspee ran aground off Rhode Island and was attacked by rebels, the crew being captured and the vessel burned.

On December 16, 1773, the tea was dumped into Boston Harbor. The British historian Lecky described this affair as "The Tea Riot of Boston," and another Britisher, Green, described it as "a trivial riot." But, says the American, Fisher, this was "*the one moment of all that troubled time in which no compromise was possible. It was the one supreme moment in a controversy supremely important to mankind*, and in which the common sense of the world has since acknowledged that they were wholly in the right."

On December 13, 14, 1774, another guerilla fight was staged by the Irishman, John Sullivan, in an attack on Fort William and Mary at Portsmouth. He seized the fort, captured the force manning it, and seized 100 barrels of powder and 100 small arms, which supply was later used at Bunker Hill. (Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc. 1873-1875, P. 450.) *Now an attack by Sinn Fein troops upon a barracks is called a barbarous outrage on civilization.* Wherein does it differ from the "glorious war" of the Revolution?

In June, 1775, the O'Brien brothers of Machias, Maine, in the first naval fight of the Revolution in a most irregular way, by means of pitchforks, axes and a few rifles, stormed and captured a British cruiser.

On April 19, 1775, General Gage sent 800 men from Boston to Concord to seize the rebel stores. Warned by Paul Revere, the guerilla minute men by the most guerilla-like warfare, drove the troops like panting dogs back to Boston.

A contemporary account of this battle, most interesting today, is given in the Salem Gazette April 25, 1775.

"The British pillaged almost every house they passed by, breaking and destroying doors, windows, glasses, etc., and carrying off clothing and other valuable effects. It appeared to be their design to burn and destroy all before them; and nothing but our vigorous pursuit prevented their infernal purpose from being put in execution. But the savage barbarity exercised upon the bodies of our unfortunate brethren who fell was almost incredible; not contented with shooting down the unarmed, aged, and infirm, they disregarded the cries of the wounded, killing them without mercy, and mangling their bodies in the most shocking manner."

The method of treating the same affair in England is seen by the following, London Gazette, June 10, 1775:

"On the return of the troops from Concord they were very much annoyed and had several men killed and wounded, by the rebels firing from behind walls, ditches, trees, and other ambushes . . . as soon as the troops resumed their march they began to fire upon them from behind stone walls and houses . . . and such was the cruelty and barbarity of the rebels, that they scalped and cut off the ears of some of the wounded men who fell into their hands."

Woodrow Wilson, in his history describing this fight, says: "The untrained villagers could not stand against them (the British) in the open road or upon the village greens, where at first they mustered, but they could make every wayside covert a sort of ambush, every narrow bridge a trap in which to catch them at a disadvantage." (Hist. Am. Peo., II., p. 223.) And now, because the Irish troops, with a State of War recognized by the British courts as existing between England and Ireland, happen to ambush a British force, upon a military expedition similar to that of Gage's troops, it is "*assassination*" for the Irish, while it was glorious War for the colonists. It is war, and ere long England will recognize it as a most telling war, a war that may shatter the Empire.

On *June 17, 1775*, over a year before the Declaration of Independence, on Bunker Hill another guerilla fight was staged, so irregular that it is still disputed whether Prescott or Putnam was in command.

When these so-called Americans rant about the Sinn Fein Reign of Terror they forget the treatment meted out to the Loyalists in the American Revolution. They forget that the one means whereby the patriots controlled the situation and prevented the troops and loyalists from overwhelming the rebels was a "reign of terror." Loyalists were tarred and feathered, ridden on rails, gagged, bound, and locked in rooms with every opening sealed and a fire smoking on the hearth; their homes were raided for arms, and riddled with bullets, their horses and cattle were poisoned, mutilated, and killed; judges were torn from the bench and prevented from holding court; even the home of the Royal Governor of Massachusetts and all the furniture therein was wrecked. In fact the term "Lynch Law" originated during the Revolution. (Fisher—True Hist. Am. Rev., Ch. VIII.)

Compared with the reign of terror in the Colonies, the "reign of terror" in Ireland is but "peaceful persuasion." In the colonies civilians were the sufferers while in Ireland it is but the British army of occupation and its subordinate arms that suffer.

Fourthly let us survey the British methods of warfare during the American Revolution and see how they compare with their present day methods in Ireland.

In the matter of propaganda intended to stir up hatred against the colonies we have observed the British report of the battle of Lexington, containing the charge that the patriots resorted to scalping. This is typical of the reports published in England of all matters referring to the colonies. It is to be noted that although Lecky, in his history of this battle, goes into great detail, even giving the numbers on each side, killed, wounded, and captured, he says nothing about scalping by the patriots as he undoubtedly would have done if such an event had occurred. Green makes no such comment, nor does Guizot, the French historian.

On the other hand we find ample evidence of atrocities upon the part of the British troops, and of scalping by their Indian allies.

In July, 1778, Loyalists and Indians raided the Wyoming valley in Northern Pennsylvania. After the heroic resistance of a few old men and boys, the settlers including women and children were butchered and scalped without mercy, the village set on fire. The prisoners were thrown or chased into the flames and held there with pitchforks or laid in a circle and tomahawked. There was another similar raid with similar results in the Cherry Valley of New York, and the whole northern frontier for months was deluged in blood until such raids were checked by General John Sullivan in 1779. (Fisher, *Supra*, pp. 379, 380)

In the fall of 1778 "No Flint" Grey raided, burned and destroyed New Bedford, Fair Haven, and Old Tappan on the Hudson, killing a large number of prisoners. (Stryker—Massacre near old Tappan.)

On October 15, 1778, Ferguson raided the Jersey coast at Egg Harbor and slaughtered his prisoners. (Stryker—Affair at Egg Harbor.)

Prevost invaded South Carolina and desolated the country, burning and destroying houses, crops, food supplies, horses and cattle, leaving such a desert that over 1000 people starved to death.

Matthews sacked and burned Norfolk and Portsmouth in Virginia, shooting unarmed people and allowing his troops all liberties with the female population.

The British methods in Ireland today, are euphoniously termed "Reprisals." The burning and destruction of Cork, and numerous other cities and towns, the killing of unarmed people including women and children, the destruction of creameries, crops and cattle, show that British warfare is no more civilized today than it was in 1776.

The shooting of four members of the Irish Republican Army on April 28, 1921, reminds one of the methods of Ferguson and Grey in 1778. These four prisoners were condemned for "levying war against the British Crown Forces." Lloyd George on November 8, 1920 in the House of Commons stated that a state of war existed in Ireland. Following this Gen. Macready issued a proclamation declaring the British troops "in active service" in Ireland, and on February 24, 1921, the Court of King's Bench in Ireland judicially determined that a State of War existed in Ireland. By all rules of civilized warfare these four men were prisoners of war, yet they were shot down in cold blood as had been seven others before them.

Another instance of similarity between the two revolutions is England's attempt to compromise. In 1778 Parliament sent a commission to the colonies, authorized to suspend the operation of every statute complained of by the colonies. In other words everything was offered in the way of legislative independence if the colonies would merely retain the imperial con-

nection through "the king alone." (Fisher, *Supra*, pp. 370, 371.) This, of course, was rejected by the patriots. Washington said, "Let us accept nothing short of independence . . . a peace on any other conditions would be a source of perpetual disputes." (Guizot—*Hist. France* V, p. 275.) So too we find England today attempting in every way to compromise with Ireland at anything less than separation, and true to the precedent of Washington, we find Michael Collins, the hope of Ireland, at the head of his guerilla fighters, scorning any compromise and openly declaring that his irregulars have the British troops beaten.

We see running all through the American Revolution and the Irish Revolution an intense spirit of nationalism, intensified in Ireland by reason of her seven hundred and fifty-two years' struggle. The term "Self determination" of which we heard so much before the armistice, and have seen so little since is but an echo of the Declaration of Independence. It is the same spirit which succeeded in America that has ever animated Ireland.

Yet we find people such as Ex-Secretary of State Lansing, in the Saturday Evening Post, April 9, 1921, saying that "self determination" was but a catch phrase, given currency by Mr. Wilson; that while the phrase itself expressed "a great political principle . . . generally recognized as morally right," yet, "the assumption that self-determination is a right inherent to mankind is a *menace* to peace in the world because it excites false hopes and produces political unrest that may develop into open resistance to established authority," and further that

"The time has come when the belief in self-determination as an inherent right which ought to be applied in all cases and under all conditions should be denounced by the nations."

This is a surprising doctrine, more surprising from an American, and yet most surprising from a former Secretary of State of the United States.

To summarize Mr. Lansing's argument in a few words it appears as follows:

1. "Self-determination is a generally recognized moral right."
2. The recognition or the application of that right may at times be inexpedient to some nations.
3. The right of self-determination must therefore be denounced and cast aside.

In other words, "If right conflicts with expediency, right must be subordinated."

How can Mr. Lansing reconcile the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution with his theory of scrapping Self-Determination. Every argument Mr. Lansing used relative to Self-Determination applied with greater force to the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

The Declaration of Independence was at that time "a menace to peace in the world" because it did excite hopes and did "Produce political unrest that (did) develop into resistance to established authority." It not only was a menace but it actually involved France, Spain, Holland, Spain and Prussia, as well as England and the colonies, directly or indirectly in the Revolution.

"When you deny the right of a naturally separated people to struggle without end for independence, you deny the most fundamental and necessary, the most powerful and far reaching, the most scientific and well settled principle of moral conduct that history has disclosed." (S. G. Fisher—"Am. Rev. & Boer War" p. 22.)

We have been taught, until recently at least, to glory in all that the Revolution meant, its principles, its battles, its dangers, its hopes, its wonderful outcome and meaning, not only for America but for the world. Would Mr. Lansing retrace one step of that Era? Would he change one page of its history? Yet every nation, every people upon the face of the earth today has as much right to believe in, to hope for, and to fight for liberty and self-determination as the colonies had in 1776.

Lansing suggested the casting aside of this morally sound doctrine merely because its application might cause some diffi-

culty; because it might forsooth, be inexpedient for England to recognize it; because it might excite hopes of freedom and develop resistance to "established authority." In the presidential election last fall, by a plurality of seven million, the American people declared against the League of Nations and all that it meant and President Harding in his message to Congress of April 12, 1921, stated to the world that America had forever repudiated such a league. One of the greatest objections to that League was Article X, which provided that

"The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

Under this article the entire world would be frozen into inaction. Any progress toward liberty, would be practically impossible. No people anywhere, at any time, might hope for, or fight for liberty. All subject races would be doomed for all time to servitude for any attempt at liberty would necessarily be resisted by the nation denying such liberty, and under the guaranty of all other members of the League, such attempt would be forcibly suppressed by the joint efforts of all such members. America refused to deny any people the exercise of that sacred right of revolution which brought America into existence.

Yet Mr. Lansing's theory of denying the right of self-determination to any and all peoples, would have exactly the same effect as Article X of the League of Nations.

This was the theory of government entertained by the so-called Holy Alliance, (1819) in supporting the divine right of Kings. In the document which has been more or less generally accepted as embodying the terms or the principles of the agreement entered into by the Holy Alliance appears the following:

"Article I. The high contracting parties being convinced that the system of representative government is equally incompatible with the monarchical principles as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people with the divine right, engage mutually, and in the most solemn manner, to use all their efforts to put an end to the system of representative governments, in whatever country it may exist in Europe, and to prevent its being introduced in those countries where it is not yet known."

It was the promulgation of such principles that called forth the Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine goes to the roots of the ever-recurring conflict between autocratic pretensions and democratic needs. It is interpreted in a few simple words by Richard Olney as follows:

“It is that no European Power or combination of European Powers shall forcibly deprive an American State of the right and power of self-government, and of shaping for itself its own political fortunes and destinies.”

This same argument of inexpediency put forward by Mr. Lansing, and now used to divert America from consideration of Ireland, has been used many times in the past, and at every opportunity has been repudiated by America both in its application to foreign nations and America’s relations with them. On *January 19, 1824*, when Greece was in rebellion against Turkey, *Daniel Webster* offered in Congress the following resolution:

“Resolved, That provision ought to be made, by law, for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an Agent or Commissioner to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appointment.”

He was immediately assailed with the argument that such measure was inexpedient, that his motion might involve America in international trouble. His answer in part, delivered from the floor of Congress, was,

“As one of the free states among the nations, as a great and rapidly rising republic, it would be impossible for us, if we were so disposed, to prevent our principles, our sentiments, and our example from producing some effect upon the opinions and hopes of society throughout the civilized world. It rests probably with ourselves to determine whether the influence of these shall be salutary or pernicious.”

* * * *

“What do we not owe to the cause of civil and religious liberty? to the principle of lawful resistance? to the principle that society has a right to partake of its own government? As the leading republic of the world, living and breathing in these principles, and advanced, by their operation, with unequalled rapidity in our career, shall we give our consent to bring them into disrepute and disgrace?”

* * * *

“Does it not become us then, is it not a duty imposed on us, to give our weight to the side of liberty and justice, to let mankind know that we are not tired of our own institutions.”

* * * *

“When we have discharged that duty, we may leave the rest to the disposition of Providence.”

From 1822 to 1853 the same right to self-determination and to fight for freedom was recognized on at least 14 different occasions with reference to the various South American countries, the Monroe Doctrine being relied upon to protect such South American nations in their struggle to maintain their freedom.

In 1852 Hungary was in rebellion against Austria. Daniel Webster was then Secretary of State. Kossuth the rebel leader was invited to this country and saluted as a great hero. On *January 7th, 1852*, at a dinner given to Kossuth at Washington, Webster said:

"Let it be borne on all the winds of heaven—that the sympathies of the Government of the United States, and all the people of the United States, have been attracted toward a nation struggling for national independence."

* * * *

"We may talk of it as we please, but there is nothing that satisfies the human mind in an enlightened age, unless man is governed by his own country and the institutions of his own government. No matter how easy be the yoke of a foreign power, no matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulders, if it is not imposed by the voice of his own nation and of his own country, he will not, he cannot, and he *means* not to be happy under its burden."

* * * *

"Therefore, I say that wherever there is a nation of sufficient intelligence and numbers and wealth to maintain a government, distinguished in its character and its history and its institutions, that nation cannot be happy but under a government of its own choice."

The Austrian Ambassador, Von Hülsemann, on *April 29, 1852*, protested against this alleged encouragement and approval given by Webster to Hungary's rebellion, and in a most powerful answer to Von Hülsemann,—a great state paper—Webster, said in part:

" . . . if the United States wish success to countries contending for popular constitutions and national independence, it is only because they regard such constitutions and such national independence, not as imaginary, but as real blessings.

* * * *

" . . . when the people of the United States behold the people of foreign countries . . . spontaneously moving toward the adoption of institutions like their own, it surely cannot be expected of them to remain wholly indifferent spectators."

And answering the argument as to expediency, Webster at the end of his answer stated,

"Toward the conclusion of his note Mr. Hülsemann remarks, that 'if the government of the United States were to think it proper to take an indirect part in the political movements of Europe, American policy would be exposed to acts of retaliation, and to certain inconvenience which would not fail to affect the commerce and industry of the two hemispheres.' As to this possible fortune, this hypothetical retaliation, the government and people of the United States are quite willing to take their chances and abide their destiny. Taking neither a direct nor an indirect part in the domestic or intestine movements of Europe, they have no fear of events of the nature alluded to by Mr. Hülsemann."

The immortal *Lincoln* facing the same argument as to expediency during the civil war answered that argument for all time. In his second inaugural address, he said,

"Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled up by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

And again he said,

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty, as we understand it."

America will always stand true to its Declaration of Independence, the principles and ideals therein set forth. It will never turn an unsympathetic or deaf ear to any people crying for freedom. The moment America denies the justice of her own creation, at that moment liberty dies in America—for liberty in America can only be maintained by supporting liberty everywhere.

England opposes this principle of self-determination with reference to Ireland as she did with reference to the colonies. It is imperialism's last effort against a rising nation. It is England's fight to preserve her Empire.

England's Empire is the greatest known to history. This small island of less than 40 million people rules over a subject

population of about 500 million, and an area of approximately one-quarter of the earth's land surface, and all of its water surface. But there have been empires before, and their history undoubtedly will be that of England.

Balshazzar feasted in his great hall and saw the end of his Babylonian Empire written upon the wall by an unseen hand, and lizards now bask in the sun undisturbed where he and Nebuchadnezzar reigned.

Darius and Cyrus built a vast Persian Empire upon the ruins of Babylon, and saw the Greek, Alexander, smash their great structure into fragments, and today Darius and Cyrus are but names lost in the realm of mythology.

Alexander then reared the great empire of Greece, and sighed for other worlds to conquer, and Greece was overwhelmed by Rome.

The Caesars in turn constructed the most powerful empire known to history at the time. All the world was Rome's, and yet Rome was laid waste in 476 and is now returned to her original seven hills.

The Holy Roman Empire, rising from the ruins of Rome, is but a name and Barbarossa still awaits in vain the call of his people. Spain's great empire perished with the Armada, Napoleon's empire died at Waterloo and was forever laid to rest at St. Helena. England and Japan alone remain.

The lamented Padriac Pearce, first President of the Irish Republic, in a short verse translated from the Gaelic of the middle ages which you may classify as you will, either as a model of Christian trust in God's justice, or a gem of Pagan vengeance, looked into the future and read England's destiny in these words:

"The wind has scattered into dust
Alexander, Caesar, and all who followed their sway:
Tara is green; behold how Troy lieth low
And even the English
Perchance their hour too will come."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 377 773 7

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 377 773 7

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 377 773 7

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5